

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

DONALD PRYOR,

Case No. 1:25-cv-167

Plaintiff,

Hopkins, J.
Bowman, M.J.

vs.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY,

Defendants.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On April 22, 2025, the Court Ordered Plaintiff to submit a copy of a Notice of his Right to Sue Letter from the EEOC, or show cause, in writing, by May 6, 2025, why this matter should not be dismissed as premature for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. To date, Plaintiff has not submitted submit a copy of a Notice of his Right to Sue Letter from the EEOC, nor has he responded to the pending Show Cause Order.

Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this matter and to obey an Order of the Court warrants dismissal of this case pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(b). *See Jourdan v. Jabe*, 951 F.2d 108, 109–10 (6th Cir.1991). District courts have the power to *sua sponte* dismiss civil actions for want of prosecution to “manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630–31, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 8 L.Ed.2d 734 (1962). *See also Jourdan*, 951 F.2d at 109. Though plaintiff is proceeding pro se, as stated by the Supreme Court, “we have never suggested that procedural rules in ordinary civil litigation should be interpreted so as to excuse mistakes by those who proceed without counsel.” *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993).

Accordingly, **IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT** Plaintiff's complaint be **DISMISSED** without prejudice as to Defendant Miami University for failure to prosecute and failure to obey an Order of the Court.

s/ Stephanie K. Bowman
Stephanie K. Bowman
United States Magistrate Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

DONALD PRYOR,

Case No. 1:25-cv-167

Plaintiff,

vs.

Hopkins, J.
Bowman, M.J.

MIAMI UNIVERSITY,

Defendants.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to this Report & Recommendation (“R&R”) within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. That period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion by either side for an extension of time. All objections shall specify the portion(s) of the R&R objected to, and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. A party shall respond to an opponent’s objections within **FOURTEEN DAYS** after being served with a copy of those objections. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. See *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).